Casimir-Polder interaction from exact diagonalization and state mixing near surfaces

Sofia Ribeiro[1], Stefan Yoshi Buhmann[2,3], Thomas Stielow[4] and Stefan Scheel[4]
[1] *School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom*
[2] *Physikalisches Institut, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Hermann-Herder-Str. 3, 79104 Freiburg, Germany*
[3] *Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Albertstr. 19, 79104 Freiburg, Germany and*
[4] *Institut für Physik, Universität Rostock, Universitätsplatz 3, D-18051 Rostock, Germany*

Dispersion forces have a sizeable effect on the energy levels of highly excited Rydberg atoms when brought close to material surfaces. Rydberg atoms experience energy shifts in the GHz range at micrometer distances, suggestive of considerable state admixture. We show that despite the non-applicability of perturbation theory for Rydberg atoms near a surface, the energy shift due to the dispersion interaction can be obtained from an exact diagonalization of the interaction Hamiltonian by finding the zeros of the Pick function. Moreover, we show that contrary to intuition from single-mode approaches, surface-induced state mixing is generally suppressed even for large interaction energies. We give a tailored example where mixing is observable despite this effect.

PACS numbers: 12.20.-m, 42.50.Nn, 32.80.Ee

arXiv:1406.0172v2 [quant-ph] 8 Jun 2015

INTRODUCTION

The change of atomic properties due to interactions with the quantized electromagnetic field in the presence of macroscopic bodies is a well-known effect. The theoretical approaches to the body-induced atomic (Casimir-Polder) energy shift are usually based on second-order perturbation theory [1, 2]. A perturbative framework tacitly assumes the effect to be small, i.e., that the energy levels and their differences are not changed significantly:

$$\left|\langle m|\,\hat{H}_{\rm int}\,|n\rangle\right| \ll \left|E_m^0 - E_n^0\right|. \tag{1}$$

Valid for ground-state and lowly-excited atoms, this assumption breaks down for Rydberg atoms as the dipole-matrix elements can become huge and the spectrum of neighbouring excited states is very dense.

Research in the field of Rydberg atoms has recently seen an enormous resurgence due to their extraordinary properties and the technological advances in their coherent manipulation. This has resulted in proposals and, in part, implementation of photonic quantum devices such as quantum gates and single-photon sources [3–7], quantum computers [8, 9] and quantum simulators [10], ideas that could also be expanded to Rydberg states of ions [11]. In all these situations, precision control of atomic systems requires well-understood surface effects.

The term Rydberg atom refers to an atom with one or more of its valence electrons in a state with large principal quantum number. Such states are relatively long-lived [12]. Their large radius gives Rydberg states gigantic dipole transition moments, resulting in strong long-range dipole-dipole interactions. The subsequent van der Waals dispersion interaction prevents the multiple excitation of Rydberg states in atomic ensembles, an effect known as dipole (or Rydberg) blockade [13, 14].

Similarly, due to their large electric polarizability the Casimir-Polder force on atoms in Rydberg states near a surface is several orders of magnitude larger than the corresponding force on atoms in their ground state. This force scales with the principal quantum number n as n^4 [15]. For this reason, experimental investigation into atom-surface interactions have often used Rydberg atoms [16–21]. In the example of Ref. [16], highly excited Cs and Na atoms were passed through a cavity of gold-coated mirrors and the transmission was measured. Due to the attractive atom-surface interaction, a deflection towards the surface was observed. The interaction strength for atoms prepared in states with principal quantum numbers $n = 12 - 30$ was shown to be $3 - 4$ orders of magnitude larger than those for ground-state atoms.

Such extreme body-induced level shifts naturally fall into a regime where perturbation theory breaks down. This is shown in Fig. 1 where we compare the Casimir-Polder shift (black dashed curves) with the atomic unperturbed energies (red lines). Instead, one has to find the eigenvalues of the matrix interaction

$$W = \langle\psi|\,\hat{H}\,|\psi\rangle \tag{2}$$

in a suitably chosen basis. In the past, Bogoliubov-type transformations have been used to exactly diagonalize the atom-field Hamiltonian modelling the atoms as three dimensional isotropic harmonic oscillators interacting with the quantum electromagnetic field. In this way, both the atom-atom interaction [22] and atom-surface interaction have been derived [23].

Strong coupling of a single cavity mode ν with an excited atom can be described in relatively simple terms on the basis of the Jaynes-Cummings model. Here, an exact diagonalization is readily available [24] where the eigenstates of the strongly coupled system are superpositions of the type $\alpha|1\rangle|0_\nu\rangle + \beta|0\rangle|1_\nu\rangle$ [25, 26]. For sufficiently large interaction energies, an initially excited atom will hence acquire a considerable mixing amplitude β when interacting with the cavity mode. As we will show, the

situation is drastically different for the broad-band coupling of an atom with a single surface.

In this article, we develop a non-perturbative description of the strong interaction of a multilevel Rydberg atom with a nearby surface. This is achieved by exploiting the arrowhead form of the interaction Hamiltonian to find its exact eigenvalues as zeros of the Pick function [27]. We obtain results for both energy shifts and mixing amplitudes, showing that the latter typically deviate from the above intuition from resonant single-mode coupling.

MACROSCOPIC QUANTUM ELECTRODYNAMICS

In electric dipole approximation, the Hamiltonian that governs the dynamics of the coupled atom-field system can be written as [2]

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H} &= \hat{H}_F + \hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_{\rm int} \\ &= \int_0^\infty d\omega \int d^3r\, \hbar\omega\, \hat{\mathbf{f}}^\dagger(\mathbf{r},\omega)\cdot\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r},\omega) + \sum_n \hbar\omega_n \hat{A}_{nn} \\ &\quad - \sum_{m,n} \hat{A}_{nm}\mathbf{d}_{nm}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{r}_A)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Here, $\hat{H}_F$ is the Hamiltonian of the medium-assisted electromagnetic field which is expressed in terms of a set of bosonic variables $\hat{\mathbf{f}}^\dagger(\mathbf{r},\omega)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r},\omega)$ that are interpreted as amplitude operators for the elementary excitations of the medium-field system (polaritons). The Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_A$ of the uncoupled atom can be expanded in terms of its eigenenergies $E_n = \hbar\omega_n$ and eigenstates $|n\rangle$, where $\hat{A}_{nm} = |n\rangle\langle m|$ denotes the transition operators between two internal atomic states. The atom-field interaction is given in terms of dipole transition matrix elements $\mathbf{d}_{nm} = \langle n|\,\hat{\mathbf{d}}\,|m\rangle$ and the electric-field operator

$$\hat{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{r}_A) = \int_0^\infty d\omega \int d^3r\, \left[\mathbf{G}_e(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r},\omega)\cdot\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r},\omega) + \text{h.c.}\right]. \tag{4}$$

The tensor $\mathbf{G}_e(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r},\omega)$ is related to the classical Green tensor $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r},\omega)$, i.e. the solution of the Helmholtz equation with the appropriate boundary conditions, by

$$\mathbf{G}_e(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega) = i\frac{\omega^2}{c^2}\sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{\varepsilon_0\pi}\text{Im}\,\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}',\omega)}\,\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega), \tag{5}$$

where $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r},\omega)$ is the (complex) dielectric permittivity of the macroscopic body.

EXACT DIAGONALIZATION: GROUND-STATE TWO-LEVEL ATOM

Let us consider first a two-level atom with energy levels $|1\rangle$ and $|0\rangle$, for which the dipole operator is $\hat{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{d}\hat{A}_{10} + \mathbf{d}^*\hat{A}_{01}$. The atomic Hamiltonian is thus

$$\hat{H}_A = \hbar\omega_0\hat{A}_{00} + \hbar\omega_1\hat{A}_{11}. \tag{6}$$

It is useful to introduce position-dependent photon-like amplitude operators $\hat{a}(\mathbf{r},\omega)$ and $\hat{a}^\dagger(\mathbf{r},\omega)$ as [28]

$$\hat{a}(\mathbf{r},\omega) = -\frac{1}{\hbar g(\mathbf{r},\omega)}\int d^3r'\mathbf{d}\cdot\mathbf{G}_e(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega)\cdot\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{r}',\omega) \tag{7}$$

with a normalization factor

$$g(\mathbf{r},\omega) = \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0\omega^2}{\hbar\pi}\mathbf{d}\cdot\text{Im}\,\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r},\omega)\cdot\mathbf{d}^*}\,. \tag{8}$$

The creation operator $\hat{a}^\dagger(\mathbf{r},\omega)$ can be used to define single-quantum excitations from the ground state $|\{0\}\rangle$ of the medium-assisted electromagnetic field, $|\mathbf{r},\omega\rangle = \hat{a}^\dagger(\mathbf{r},\omega)\,|\{0\}\rangle$. These ladder operators obey the usual commutation rule $\left[\hat{a}(\mathbf{r},\omega),\hat{a}^\dagger(\mathbf{r},\omega')\right] = \delta(\omega-\omega')$. The states $|\mathbf{r},\omega\rangle$ are eigenstates of the field Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_F$ such that

$$\hat{H}_F\,|\mathbf{r},\omega\rangle = \hbar\omega\,|\mathbf{r},\omega\rangle\,. \tag{9}$$

The interaction Hamiltonian can then be re-written as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}_{\rm int} = \hbar\int_0^\infty d\omega\,&\left[g(\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)\,\hat{a}(\mathbf{r}_A,\omega) + g^*(\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)\,\hat{a}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)\right] \\ &\times\left(\hat{A}_{01}+\hat{A}_{10}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

without applying the rotating-wave approximation.

The initial state is taken to be the ground state $|0_A\rangle$ of the two-level atom and the vacuum state of the medium-assisted field $|\{0\}\rangle$ which is connected via the interaction Hamiltonian to a (continuous) set of final states $|1_A\rangle\,|\mathbf{r}_A,\omega\rangle$ [29]. Our aim is to diagonalize the total Hamiltonian within this basis, that is, to find the exact solutions of $\hat{H}|\psi\rangle = \hbar\Omega|\psi\rangle$, where

$$|\psi\rangle = C_0\,|0_A\rangle\,|\{0\}\rangle + \int_0^\infty d\omega\, C_1(\omega)\,|1_A\rangle\,|\mathbf{r}_A,\omega\rangle\,. \tag{11}$$

Note that this amounts to truncating the Hilbert space to the zero- and single-photon sectors. Applying the Hamiltonian to the state $|\psi\rangle$ yields a set of equations

$$(\omega_0-\Omega)\,C_0 + \int_0^\infty d\omega\, C_1(\omega)g(\mathbf{r}_A,\omega) = 0, \tag{12a}$$

$$g^*(\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)C_0 + (\omega+\omega_1-\Omega)\,C_1(\omega) = 0 \tag{12b}$$

for the eigenfrequencies Ω.

For further investigation, we discretize the frequency integral in Eq. (12a) according to

$$\int_0^\infty d\omega\, C_1(\omega)g(\mathbf{r}_A,\omega) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta\omega\, C_1(\omega^{(i)})g(\mathbf{r}_A,\omega^{(i)}). \tag{13}$$

This leads to a set of $N+1$ equations

$$(\omega_0 - \Omega)\, C_0 + \Delta\omega \sum_{i=1}^{N} C_1(\omega^{(i)}) g(\mathbf{r}_A, \omega^{(i)}) = 0, \quad (14a)$$

$$g^*(\mathbf{r}_A, \omega^{(i)}) C_0 + (\omega^{(i)} + \omega_1 - \Omega) C_1(\omega^{(i)}) = 0, \quad (14b)$$

which can be brought into the matrix form

$$\mathcal{M} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0 \quad (15)$$

with an $(N+1)$-dimensional coefficient vector

$$\mathbf{c} = (C_0, C_1^{(1)}, \ldots, C_1^{(N)})^T.$$

The matrix

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} a & r_1 & r_2 & \cdots & r_N \\ c_1 & d_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ c_2 & 0 & d_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_N & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & d_N \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

is of arrowhead type with entries

$$a = \omega_0 - \Omega\,, \quad d_i = \omega^{(i)} + \omega_1 - \Omega\,, \quad (17a)$$

$$r_i = \Delta\omega g(\mathbf{r}_A, \omega^{(i)})\,, \quad c_i = g^*(\mathbf{r}_A, \omega^{(i)})\,. \quad (17b)$$

The eigenvalue equation (15) has a unique solution if the determinant of $\mathcal{M}$ vanishes, where the latter takes the form

$$\det \mathcal{M} = (\omega_0 - \Omega) \prod_{i=1}^{N} (\omega^{(i)} + \omega_1 - \Omega) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Delta\omega |g(\mathbf{r}_A, \omega^{(i)})|^2 \prod_{j \neq i} (\omega^{(i)} + \omega_1 - \Omega) = 0 \quad (18)$$

and is known as the Pick function [27]. The solution to the above equation is

$$(\omega_0 - \Omega) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Delta\omega \frac{|g(\mathbf{r}_A, \omega^{(i)})|^2}{\omega^{(i)} + \omega_1 - \Omega} = 0. \quad (19)$$

Performing the continuum limit by reversing relation (13) and inserting the normalization $g(\mathbf{r}_A, \omega)$, Eq. (8), we find

$$\omega_0 - \Omega = \frac{\mu_0}{\hbar\pi} \int_0^\infty d\omega\, \frac{\omega^2 \mathbf{d} \cdot \operatorname{Im} \boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A, \mathbf{r}_A, \omega) \cdot \mathbf{d}^*}{\omega + \omega_1 - \Omega}. \quad (20)$$

This is a transcendental equation for the eigenvalue Ω.

Writing $\Omega = \omega_0 + \delta\omega_0$ and noting that $\omega_A = \omega_1 - \omega_0$ is the (unperturbed) atomic transition frequency, Eq. (20) assumes its more familiar form

$$\delta\omega_0 = -\frac{\mu_0}{\hbar\pi} \int_0^\infty d\omega\, \frac{\omega^2 \mathbf{d} \cdot \operatorname{Im} \boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A, \mathbf{r}_A, \omega) \cdot \mathbf{d}^*}{\omega + \omega_A - \delta\omega_0}. \quad (21)$$

Only if the energy shift $\delta\omega_0$ is much smaller compared to the transition frequency ω_A, $\delta\omega_0 \ll \omega_A$, does Eq. (21) revert to its perturbative form without $\delta\omega_0$ in the denominator under the frequency integral [1, 2].

The exact diagonalization also yields the normalized eigenvector of the matrix (16) corresponding to the eigenvalue Ω [27]:

$$v = \frac{x}{\|x\|},\ x = [1, -r_1/d_1, -r_2/d_2, \ldots, -r_N/d_N]^T\,. \quad (22)$$

Substituting Eqs. (17) for r_i and d_i and performing the continuum limit, one finds

$$C_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}}\,, \quad C_1(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}} \frac{g(\mathbf{r}_A, \omega)}{\omega + \omega_A - \delta\omega_0} \quad (23)$$

with the normalization factor

$$\mathcal{N} = 1 + \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{|g(\mathbf{r}_A, \omega)|^2}{(\omega + \omega_A - \delta\omega_0)^2}\,. \quad (24)$$

Hence, the probability for the atom to be found in its initial, unperturbed ground state when brought close to the surface is

$$p_0 = |C_0|^2 = \left[1 + \frac{\mu_0}{\hbar\pi} \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2 \mathbf{d} \cdot \operatorname{Im} \boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A, \mathbf{r}_A, \omega) \cdot \mathbf{d}^*}{(\omega + \omega_A - \delta\omega_0)^2}\right]^{-1}. \quad (25)$$

On the other hand, there is a finite probability

$$p_1 = \int_0^\infty d\omega\, |C_1(\omega)|^2 = 1 - p_0 \quad (26)$$

for the atom to be transferred to its excited state due to surface-induced state-mixing. Alternatively, these probabilities could have been determined using the Fano diagonalization method [29].

EXTENSION TO MULTILEVEL RYDBERG ATOMS

The analysis for a two-level system can easily be extended to multiple excited states that may be distinguished by suitable quantum numbers. For an atom initially prepared in an unperturbed state $|n_A\rangle$, we are seeking eigenstates of the form

$$|\psi_n\rangle = C_n\, |n_A\rangle\, |\{0\}\rangle + \sum_{k \neq n} \int_0^\infty d\omega \int d^3r \mathbf{C}_k(\mathbf{r}, \omega) \cdot |k_A\rangle\, |\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{r}, \omega)\rangle \quad (27)$$



FIG. 1: (Color online) Change of energy of the $32S_{1/2}$ and $32P_{1/2}$ Rydberg states of Rb in the presence of a gold plate (black solid lines). We compare the self-consistent results with those from perturbation theory (inset plot in black dashed lines). The substrate gold was describe by a Drude model $\varepsilon(\omega) = 1 - \dfrac{\omega_p^2}{\omega(\omega + i\gamma)}$ with $\omega_p = 1.37 \times 10^{16}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ and $\gamma = 4.12 \times 10^{13}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$. The atomic dipole matrix elements were calculated using wave functions based on the Numerov method [35, 36]. Due to their sharply peaked nature as a function of n, only states with $|\Delta n| \leq 2$ had to be considered.

with $|\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{r},\omega)\rangle = \hat{\mathbf{f}}^\dagger(\mathbf{r},\omega)\,|\{0\}\rangle$. The eigenvalue equations then take the form

$$(\omega_n - \Omega_n)\, C_n - \frac{1}{\hbar}\sum_{k\neq n}\int_0^\infty d\omega \int d^3r\, \mathbf{d}_{nk}\cdot\mathbf{G}_e\left(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r},\omega\right)\cdot\mathbf{C}_k(\mathbf{r},\omega) = 0, \tag{28a}$$

$$-\frac{1}{\hbar}\,\mathbf{d}_{kn}\cdot\mathbf{G}_e\left(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r},\omega\right) C_n + (\omega + \omega_k - \Omega_n)\,\mathbf{C}_k(\mathbf{r},\omega) = 0. \tag{28b}$$

We generalize the discretization to the case of the index i now running over the set of variables $\{k,\mathbf{r},\omega\}$. The Pick function then yields an eigenvalue $\Omega_n = \omega_n + \delta\omega_n$ with

$$\delta\omega_n = -\frac{\mu_0}{\hbar\pi}\sum_{k\neq n}\mathcal{P}\int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2\mathbf{d}_{nk}\cdot\mathrm{Im}\boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)\cdot\mathbf{d}_{kn}}{\omega + \omega_{kn} - \delta\omega_n}\,. \tag{29}$$

In order to interpret the implications of our truncation of the Hilbert space to the zero- and one-photon sectors, let us compare our result with that of perturbation theory. If the shift $\delta\omega_n$ is much smaller compared to the transition frequency ω_{kn}, $\delta\omega_n \ll \omega_{kn}$, one may neglect the term $-\delta\omega_n$ in the denominator to recover the well-known leading (second-order) perturbative result [1, 2].

$$\delta\omega_n^{(1)} = -\frac{\mu_0}{\hbar\pi}\sum_{k\neq n}\mathcal{P}\int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2\mathbf{d}_{nk}\cdot\mathrm{Im}\boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)\cdot\mathbf{d}_{kn}}{\omega + \omega_{kn}}\,. \tag{30}$$

The next-to-leading order correction can be easily found by applying a linear Taylor expansion of the right hand side of Eq. (29) in $\delta\omega_n/\omega_{kn}$:

$$\delta\omega_n^{(2)} = \frac{\mu_0^2}{\hbar\pi^2}\sum_{k\neq n}\mathcal{P}\int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2\mathbf{d}_{nk}\cdot\mathrm{Im}\boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)\cdot\mathbf{d}_{kn}}{\omega + \omega_{kn}} \times \sum_{l\neq n}\mathcal{P}\int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2\mathbf{d}_{nl}\cdot\mathrm{Im}\boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)\cdot\mathbf{d}_{ln}}{(\omega + \omega_{ln})^2}\,. \tag{31}$$

We compare this with the contributions from fourth-order perturbation theory:

$$\Delta E = -\sum_k \frac{|\langle n|\hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}|k\rangle|^2}{E_n - E_k}\sum_l \frac{|\langle n|\hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}|l\rangle|^2}{(E_n - E_l)^2} + \sum_{k,l,m}\frac{\langle n|\hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}|k\rangle\langle k|\hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}|l\rangle\langle l|\hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}|m\rangle\langle m|\hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}|n\rangle}{(E_n - E_k)(E_n - E_l)(E_n - E_m)}\,. \tag{32}$$

One observes that the correction (31) as obtained from expanding the energy shift (29) is equal to the first of the two fourth-order contributions. This type of contribution factorises. The second fourth-order contribution does not factorise; it contains two-photon intermediate states. We conclude that our diagonalisation as obtained from restricting the field Hilbert space to the zero- and one-photon sectors corresponds to a complete resummation of factorisable contributions from perturbation theory to all orders. Note that similar resummations of certain classes of perturbative contributions are in use in various fields of physics. For instance, microscopic expansions of dispersion interactions are based on a resummation of all factorisable contributions of the Born expansion [30, 31], ensuring better convergence [32]. Structurally similar resummation methods are commonly used in quantum field theories in the context of mass renormalisation [33].

Our diagonalisation method is complementary to perturbation theory in the following sense: when extending our method to the two-photon sector, one would obtain the non-factorisable fourth-order contribution of Eq. (32) above together with all its factorisable higher-order corrections.

To illustrate our results, Fig. 1 shows the results of the exact diagonalization (21) compared to the results obtained from second-order perturbation theory. One observes that, for small distances, perturbation theory does not reproduce the results from the transcendental result obtained by the exact diagonalization.

Our result (29) resembles that of Ref. [34], obtained by a different (nonperturbative) method from the dynamical evolution of the atomic variables. The difference is the absence of a term $+\delta\omega_k$ from the denominator of Eq. (29). This is due to the fact that we evaluate the Pick function separately for each state. To estimate the error made by neglecting the intermediate-state energy shifts $\delta\omega_k$ in the denominator, we have iteratively solved the set of equations (29) for $\delta\omega_n$ and its relevant neighbouring states $\delta\omega_k$. Here, we update the energy levels at each step

of the separation until numerical convergence is reached. The result is shown by the inset plot in Fig. 1. Its difference from our original result (29) is small compared to that between both results and standard second-order perturbation theory.

SURFACE-INDUCED STATE MIXING

Evaluating the eigenvector (22) for the multilevel case (28), one finds

$$C_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n}},\ \mathbf{C}_k(\mathbf{r},\omega) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n}}\frac{\mathbf{d}_{nk}\cdot\boldsymbol{G}_e(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r},\omega)}{\hbar\,(\omega+\omega_{kn}-\delta\omega_n)} \tag{33}$$

with a normalization factor

$$\mathcal{N}_n = 1+ \frac{\mu_0}{\hbar\pi}\sum_{k\neq n}\mathcal{P}\int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{\omega^2\mathbf{d}_{nk}\cdot\mathrm{Im}\boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)\cdot\mathbf{d}_{kn}}{(\omega+\omega_{kn}-\delta\omega_n)^2}\,. \tag{34}$$

The respective eigenstate (27) agrees with the perturbative result when neglecting the term $\delta\omega_n$ in the denominator — up to a phase in the amplitude $\mathbf{C}_k(\mathbf{r},\omega)$. Note that we have regularised the frequency integral via a principal value in the generalised form

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}}{(z-a)^2} = \frac{1}{2}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0+}\left[\frac{1}{(z-a+i\varepsilon)^2}+\frac{1}{(z-a-i\varepsilon)^2}\right] \tag{35}$$

so that $\mathcal{N}_n = 1+\sum_{k\neq n}\mathcal{N}_{nk}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_{nk} = {}& \frac{\mu_0}{\hbar}\,\theta(\omega_{nk}+\delta\omega_n)\\ &\times\left[\omega^2\mathbf{d}_{nk}\cdot\mathrm{Re}\,\boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)\cdot\mathbf{d}_{kn}\right]'_{\omega=\omega_{nk}+\delta\omega_n}\\ &-\frac{\mu_0}{\hbar\pi}\int_0^\infty d\xi\xi^2\frac{(\omega_{kn}-\delta\omega_n)^2-\xi^2}{[(\omega_{kn}-\delta\omega_n)^2+\xi^2]^2}\\ &\times\mathbf{d}_{nk}\cdot\boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r}_A,i\xi)\cdot\mathbf{d}_{kn}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

We then find probabilities

$$p_0 = |C_0|^2 = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n} \tag{37}$$

for the atom to remain in its initial state $|n_A\rangle$ and

$$p_k = \mathcal{P}\int_0^\infty d\omega\int d^3r\,|\mathbf{C}_k(\mathbf{r},\omega)|^2 = \frac{\mathcal{N}_{nk}}{\mathcal{N}_n} \tag{38}$$

for it to be found in a different state due to surface-induced admixture.

Note that our stationary approach is valid only under adiabatic conditions similar to those considered in the strong-coupling scenarios of Refs. [25, 26]: atom and field are originally prepared in their uncoupled eigenstates far from the surface, this separable state being an eigenstate of the total system. As the atom is slowly brought to the vicinity of the surface, the coupling is adiabatically increased. The system hence remains in an eigenstate to end up in the coupled state of our stationary approach.



FIG. 2: (Color online) Probabilities for an ^{87}Rb atom initially prepared in the state $32S_{1/2}$ of being in any other excited state when brought close to a left-handed metamaterial as a function of the atom-surface distance.

Contrary to the intuition from resonant single-mode interactions, the mixing probabilities vanish for a perfectly conducting plate in the nonretarded limit: in this case, $\omega^2\boldsymbol{G}(\mathbf{r}_A,\mathbf{r}_A,\omega)$ is independent of frequency, making both the ω-derivative and the ξ-integral in Eq. (36) vanish. From the mixing probabilities near the well-conducting gold surface as a function of atom-surface distance z_A, one observes that the presence of the metal surface mixes the unperturbed eigenstates only weakly, with admixture probabilities on the order of 10^{-5} — despite the enormous energy shifts shown in Fig. 1.

Larger admixtures are expected for materials with a strongly dispersive dielectric response at or below the Rydberg transition frequencies. As an example, let us discuss the results for a two-dimensionally isotropic, left-handed metamaterial as described in Ref. [37] via an effective dielectric function,

$$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{eff}}(\omega) = 1-\frac{\omega_p^2-\omega_0^2}{\omega^2-\omega_0^2+i\gamma\omega} \tag{39}$$

with $\omega_p = 2\pi\times 20$ GHz, $\omega_0 = 2\pi\times 10$ GHz and $\gamma = 2\pi\times 1$ GHz. A Rb atom initially prepared in the state $32S_{1/2}$ will be subject to mixing with states $kP_{1/2,3/2}$ when brought close to such a metamaterial:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|(nS_{1/2})^1\right\rangle = {}& C_{nS_{1/2}nS_{1/2}}(z_A)\left|(nS_{1/2})^0\right\rangle +\\ &\sum_k C_{nS_{1/2}kP_{1/2,3/2}}(z_A)\left|(kP_{1/2,3/2})^0\right\rangle\,,\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

In Fig. 2, we show the probabilities for this admixture as a function of atom-surface distance z_A. It can be detected by probing an originally dipole-forbidden transition $nS_{1/2}\to n'S_{1/2}$ which becomes weakly allowed due

to surface-induced mixing:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle (nS_{1/2})^1 \right| \hat{\mathbf{d}} \left| (n'S_{1/2})^0 \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_k C^*_{nS_{1/2}kP_{1/2,3/2}}(z_A) \left\langle (kP_{1/2,3/2})^0 \right| \hat{\mathbf{d}} \left| (n'S_{1/2})^0 \right\rangle .\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Its magnitude depends on the atom-surface distance and could potentially be used as a measuring tool for determining z_A.

As an example of this effect, take the state $32S_{1/2}$ where, for simplicity, we only consider the admixture with the state $32P_{1/2}$. The transition dipole moment $\mathbf{d}_{32S,33S}(z_A)$ associated with the now weakly allowed atomic transition $32S_{1/2} \rightarrow 33S_{1/2}$ is given by $C_1^*(z_A)\,\mathbf{d}_{32P,33S}$ and, from Fig. 2, one can see that the ratio $d_{32S,33S}(z_A)/d_{32S,32P}$ can be as large as 15%.

SUMMARY

Within the framework of macroscopic QED, we have shown that the failure of perturbation theory for highly excited Rydberg atoms interacting with a nearby surface can be overcome by calculating their energy shifts from an exact diagonalization of the interaction Hamiltonian. In the case of very small atom-surface distance or very large principal quantum number n, the deviation of the exact energy shift from the second-order perturbation theory result can be appreciable. We have further shown that, contrary to expectations from single-mode coupling, surface-induced state mixing is suppressed for good conductors despite large interaction energies. We have shown that in the particular example of a metamaterial with low-frequency resonances, an atom acquires a finite probability to be found in a new internal energy eigenstate when brought close to a surface.

SR is supported by grant SFRH/BD/62377/2009 from FCT, co-financed by FSE, POPH/QREN and EU. SYB was supported by the DFG (grant BU 1803/3-1) and the Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies. SS acknowledges support by the DFG (grant SCHE 612/2-1).

[1] J. M. Wylie and J. E. Sipe, Physical Review A **32**, (1985) 2030.
[2] S. Scheel and S. Y. Buhmann, Acta Physica Slovaca **58**, (2008) 675.
[3] M. Saffman and K. Mølmer, Physical Review Letters **102**, (2009) 240502.
[4] M. D. Lukin *et al*, Physical Review Letters **87**, (2001) 037901.
[5] M. Saffman and T. G. Walker, Physical Review A **66**, (2002) 065403.
[6] Y. O. Dudin and A. Kuzmich, Science **336**, (2012) 887.
[7] M. M. Müller *et al*, Physical Review A **87**, (2013) 053412.
[8] L. Isenhower *et al*, Physical Review Letters **104**, (2010) 010503.
[9] T. Wilk *et al*, Physical Review Letters **104**, (2010) 010502.
[10] H. Weimer *et al*, Nature Physics **6**, (2010) 382.
[11] F. Schmidt-Kaler *et al*, New Journal of Physics **13**, (2011) 075014.
[12] T. F. Gallagher, Rep. Prog. Physical **51**, (1988) 143.
[13] E. Urban *et al*, Nature Physics Letters **5**, (2009) 110.
[14] A. Gaëtan *et al*, Nature Physics Letters **5**, (2009) 115.
[15] J. A. Crosse, S. A. Ellingsen, K. Clements, S. Y. Buhmann and S. Scheel, Physical Review A **82**, (2010) 010901(R).
[16] A. Anderson, S. Haroche, E. A. Hinds, W. Jhe and D. Meschede, Physical Review A **37**, (1988) 3594.
[17] V. Sandoghdar, C. I. Sukenik, E. A. Hinds and S. Haroche, Physical Review Letters **68**, (1992) 3432.
[18] M. Brune, P. Nussenzveig, F. Schmidt-Kaler, F. Bernadot, A. Maali, J. M. Raimond and S. Haroche, Physical Review Letters **72**, (1994) 3339.
[19] V. Sandoghdar, C. I. Sunenik, S. Haroche and E. A. Hinds, Physical Review A **53**, (1996) 1919.
[20] M. Marrocco, M. Weidinger, R. T. Sang and H. Walther, Physical Review Letters **81**, (1998) 5784.
[21] H. Kübler, J. P. Shaffer, T. Baluktsian, R. Löw and T. Pfau, Nature Photonics **4**, (2010) 112.
[22] F. Ciccarello, E. Karpov and R. Passante, Physical Review A **72**, (2005) 052106.
[23] R. Passante, L. Rizzuto, S. Spagnolo, S. Tanaka and T. Y. Petrosky, Physical Review A **85**, (2012) 062109.
[24] E. T. Jaynes and F. W. Cummings, Proc. IEEE **51**, (1963) 89.
[25] S. Haroche, M. Brune and J. M. Raimond, Europhysics Letters **14**, (1991) 19.
[26] B.-G. Englert, J. Schwinger, A. O. Barut and M. O. Scully, Europhysics Letters **14**, (1991) 25.
[27] N. J. Stor, I. Slapnicar and J. Barlow, Linear Algebra and its Applications **464**, (2015) 62-89.
[28] S. Y. Buhmann and D.-G. Welsch, Physical Review A **77**, (2008) 012110.
[29] U. Fano, Physical Review **124**, (1961) 1866.
[30] S. Y. Buhmann and D.-G. Welsch, Appl. Phys. B **82**, 189 (2006).
[31] S. Y. Buhmann, H. Safari, D.-G. Welsch and D. T. Ho, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **13**, 427 (2006).
[32] R. Golestantian, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 012519 (2009).
[33] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schoeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (Westview, Boulder, CO, 1995).
[34] S. Y. Buhmann, L. Knöll, D.-G. Welsch and H. T. Dung, Physical Review A **70**, (2004) 052117.
[35] J. M. Blatt, J. Comput. Physical **1**, (1967) 382.
[36] S. A. Bhatti, C. L. Cromer and W. E. Cooke, Physical Review A **24**, (1981) 161.
[37] R. A. Shelby, D. R. Smith, S. C. Nemat-Nasser and S. Schultz, Applied Physics Letters **78**, (2001) 489.